



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON CERTAIN SUPPOSED LITERARY RELATIONSHIPS. I

By CAMPBELL BONNER

In his dissertation *De Alciphronis Longique aetate* (Königsberg, 1894) Hermann Reich put forth certain conclusions about the dates of Alciphron and Longus, their literary relations to each other, and the relation of Alciphron to Aelian, which may be briefly stated as follows:

1. Aelian in his *Epistulae Rusticae* imitates the letters of Alciphron. The "floruit" of Alciphron is therefore to be placed, at the latest, some years earlier than the date of Aelian's death (about 229 A. D.); and if, as seems probable, Aelian's *Epistulae Rusticae* are a youthful work, the date of Alciphron's activity must be correspondingly earlier—hardly extending beyond 200. A *terminus post quem* is derived from the circumstance that Alciphron appears to imitate certain dialogues of Lucian,¹ which can hardly be later than 170.

2. Alciphron borrowed some ideas from the pastoral romance of Longus, who is therefore to be placed in the second century.

These conclusions were accepted, not without applause, by Christ (*Gesch. d. griech. Litteratur*⁴, p. 762, n. 2, p. 852) and by Norden (*Antike Kunstprosa* I, pp. 437 f.). Rohde uttered an emphatic protest in a brief note which has been incorporated in the second edition of his *Der griechische Roman* (p. 535, n. 3 a), and W. Schmid (*Jahresber.* 1901, pp. 258 f.) questioned the validity of Reich's contentions, and indicated in general terms some opposing arguments. It is the purpose of this paper and a following one, which will deal more particularly with Longus, to

¹ That Alciphron did imitate Lucian here and there can hardly be doubted, though in several passages it is probable that the two writers merely drew from the same source—the Comedy; cf. Boldermann, *Studia Lucianea*, pp. 38 ff. Even after the work of Volkmann (*Studia Alciphronica*, I: *de Alciphronis comoediae imitatore*) and some instructive suggestions of Leo (*Plautinische Forschungen*, pp. 128 ff.) there remains, in my opinion, enough material to justify a new and thorough study of Alciphron's relation to the Comedy. At some future time I hope to return to the subject.

supply what, so far as I can discover, is still lacking—namely, a proof in detail that Reich's views of the interrelations of the three authors are mistaken. The results thus obtained are negative except for some by-products; but that fact will call forth no disparaging criticisms from readers who believe that a convenient but unsound hypothesis is less to be desired than the truth.

Because of the minute and cumulative character of Reich's evidence, it is hard to avoid a tedious particularity in discussing it; on the other hand, considerations of space recommend an allusive treatment, which could be satisfactory only to those who have read Reich's work with scrupulous care. A mean between these extremes has been sought, though certainly not always attained, in the following paragraphs.

I. ALCIPHON AND AELIAN

Aelian's supposed imitations of Alciphron are found only in the short collection of *Epistulae Rusticae*.¹ Corresponding to them in Alciphron is a much larger number of *Letters of Country Folk*,² and it is just here that we find most of the passages supposed to have been imitated by Aelian. In both collections the subject-matter is, broadly speaking, the same, namely the ordinary incidents of rural life. Resemblances of a general nature are therefore to be expected. They would probably be even more numerous, had we the whole of Aelian's collection;³ on the other hand, the verbal and stylistic differences between Alciphron and Aelian might in that case be even more marked than they are.

These general resemblances prove nothing except, perhaps, that the *epistula rustica* as a literary form antedates both Alciphron and Aelian. Turning to resemblances in detail, we find them by no means numerous. Reich tries to account for this by assuming that Aelian carefully concealed his borrowings (pp. 33 f.).

¹ I follow Hercher and Reich in maintaining the genuineness of these letters; cf. Reich, pp. 26–32, *contra* Christ *Littgesch.*⁴, p. 762. May not an argument for their authenticity be drawn from the phrase chosen by Philostratus to describe his style? ἡττικίζε δὲ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν τῇ μεσογείῳ Ἀθηναῖοι (*Vit. Soph.* ii. 31).

² Book ii in Schepers' edition, the numbering of which I follow throughout.

³ The title, ἐκ τῶν Αἰλιανοῦ ἀγροικικῶν ἐπιστολῶν shows that these twenty letters formed part of a larger collection.

Thus he argues very plausibly (pp. 34 ff.) that in four letters (13-16), which depict the character of a crusty and misanthropic farmer, Aelian has derived several ideas from the *Timon* of Lucian. But when he finds in the fact that Aelian gave another name to his churl a proof that he was carefully concealing his debt to Lucian, it is impossible to follow him (p. 35). Aelian was dealing, as everywhere in these letters, with a somewhat vaguely defined type; to make use of a character to which other authors had already given a strong individuality would have been foreign to his method. Consequently he rejects the name Timon, though he adopts Timonic characteristics for the sketch of his unsociable rustic. Furthermore, in two cases certainly, Aelian has borrowed with no attempt at concealment. In one of these cases (*Ep.* 2), to which I shall revert later, he has paraphrased some lines of Menander's *Γεωργός*. In the other (*Ep.* 6) he has made use of one of the few humorous passages in Demosthenes—a sentence in Or. 55. 18. The language is very similar, and besides, Aelian has not scrupled to give to the writer of his letter and the person to whom it is addressed the names Callarus and Callicles, both of which occur in Demosthenes' oration. Here, at any rate, there is no careful concealment.

Before entering upon an examination of the parallel passages in Alciphron and Aelian, passing notice must be given to three arguments of a general character, which Reich evidently considers of some importance. They may, however, be dismissed briefly. In the first place, Reich infers from Aelian's unquestioned inferiority to Alciphron in style and diction that the poorer artist imitated the abler (p. 39). This will convince nobody who is versed in the history of literary forms, and it may well be doubted whether Reich himself would employ such reasoning today. Again, Reich calls attention (pp. 42 ff.) to the fact that Aelian represents his characters as Attic farmers (*Ep.* 20), but fails to produce the local color of Attica, as Alciphron does, by intelligent allusions to Attic festivals, place-names, etc. Herein he sees a proof of Aelian's plagiarism. But if we had all of Aelian's letters, Attic allusions would probably be numerous enough to nullify this argument. Besides, as will be shown later, Aelian evidently tried

to infuse the Attic flavor into these trifling letters by the use of rare Attic archaisms. A similar answer suffices for another of Reich's arguments (p. 44). Pointing out that both Alciphron (iii. 29. 3) and Aelian (*Ep.* 20) take occasion to account for the learned style of the letters by reminding the reader that the characters are Athenians, Reich contends that Aelian's style does not warrant such an explanation, and, consequently, he was merely aping Alciphron, the skilled Atticist. Again a false assumption. The archaizing tendency, as we find it in Aelian, was a recognized pedantry of the time,¹ fully justifying his apology without reference to Alciphron. And may not the apology itself be a motive borrowed from earlier Atticizing *genre-epistles*?²

Equally unsatisfactory are certain arguments that Reich derives from resemblances in the subject-matter of the individual letters (pp. 36 ff.). In one pair of letters there is talk of bees and bee-keeping (Alc. ii. 20; Ael. 5)—no resemblances in detail—in three others the life of the farmer is praised (Alc. ii. 12, 13; Ael. 20), two others still are concerned with a countryman's desertion of agriculture for the sea (Alc. ii. 4; Ael. 18). Surely matters of this sort are only the commonplaces of such a literary form as the *epistula rustica*. The violation of the country woman (Alc. ii. 35; Ael. 1) is probably to be reckoned in the same category, though the letter of Aelian is not without a suggestion of the rude phallic song of Dicaeopolis (*Ach.* 271 ff.). The rejection of cheap gifts by a courtesan (Alc. iv. 9; Ael. 7, 8) doubtless played its part in the Comedy,³ and we find a similar passage in Lucian (*Dial. Mer.* 14). The fact that Alciphron alludes to the story of Timon (ii. 32) while Aelian depicts a crusty, Timon-like farmer (*Epp.* 13-16) only shows that both were impressed by the Timon

¹Cf. Lucian *Lexiph. passim*; *Vit. Demon.* 26.

²If Rohde is right in his conjecture (*Der griech. Roman*², p. 541, n. 5) that the *Θαλαττουργοί* of Nicostratus was a work analogous to Alciphron's idyllic letters, we may place the writing of *genre* letters as early as the middle of the second century; *vide* Suidas *Νικόστρατος*. On general grounds there is reason to believe that this literary form, preserving as it does the idyllic tendency of the Hellenistic age, was cultivated from the very beginning of the new sophistic movement. It should be noted that Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* ii. 31) in speaking of Aelian says *ἡ μὲν ἐπίπαν ἰδέα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀφέλεια προσβάλλουσά τι τῆς Νικοστράτου ὥρας, ἡ δὲ ἐνίοτε πρὸς Δίωνα ὀργή, κτλ.*

³Cf. Volkmann *Stud. Alciph.*, p. 24; Leo *Plaut. Forschungen*, p. 134.

legend as handled by other writers—the *Timon* of Lucian or perhaps the comedy of *Timon* by Antiphanes.

The points of similarity in details are worthy of somewhat more respectful consideration. Thus Reich shows (p. 33) that among the thirty-one proper names occurring in the *Letters* of Aelian, eight are also used by Alciphron, a proportion which certainly seems significant at first glance. However, six of these eight names—*Χρέμης*, *Φρυγία*, *Θρασυλέων*, *Παρμένων*, *Λάχης*, *Φαιδρίας*—are sufficiently familiar from the Comedy and other sources. Two are comparatively rare—*Ἀνθεμίων* and *Κωμαρχίδης* (Alc. ii. 29; iii. 25; Ael. *Epp.* 2, 4). Yet the former is used by Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, and Plutarch (cf. Pape *Eigennamen*), and it is so suggestive of rural surroundings that it is not strange to find both Alciphron and Aelian using it; compare Alciphron's use of the name *Ἀμπελίων* (ii. 27). The name *Κωμαρχίδης* occurs, aside from Alciphron and Aelian, only once; but that once, be it noted, is in Aristophanes (*Peace* 1142). Reich over-boldly declares (p. 42) that no traces of imitation of Aristophanes have been found in Aelian,¹ while on the other hand it is known that Alciphron borrowed from Aristophanes; consequently, Aelian must have taken this name, as well as others, from Alciphron's *Letters*. But proof of Aelian's use of Aristophanes will be forthcoming in the course of this paper, and the argument from proper names must be regarded as worthless.

The remainder of Reich's evidence is concerned almost entirely with rare words, or rare uses of common words, which occur in both Alciphron and Aelian. In the following numbered paragraphs Reich's citations are reproduced, and others are added, especially from the comic poets.² An inspection of these additional data should prove that the rarities had a wider circulation

¹Schmid's study of the language of Aelian (*Atticismus*, Vol. III) was apparently not yet accessible to Reich, though it bears the date 1893.

²My obligations to Schmid's lists (*Atticismus* III, on Aelian) are manifest; in strictly verbal matters I have been able to supplement them in only a few cases. Schmid, however, does not deal with connected passages, does not separate comic from other poetic words, and does not note that comic expressions are disproportionately frequent in the *Epistulae Rusticae*. He has divined, but not demonstrated, the true position of Aelian with regard to Alciphron and to the Comedy (*Jahresber.* 1901, p. 258).

than Reich thought, and consequently that the inference as to an imitation is unwarranted.

1. Let us first examine two connected passages brought together by Reich, and compare with them a third from Aristophanes.

Alc. ii. 15. 1: τοῦμου παιδίου γενέσια ἑορτάζων ἤκειν σε ἐπὶ τὴν πανδαισίαν, ὦ Πιθακ<ν>ίων, παρακαλῶ, ἤκειν δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀλλ' ἐπαγόμενον τὴν γυναικα καὶ τὰ παιδία καὶ τὸν σύργαστρον· εἰ βούλοιο δέ, καὶ τὴν κύνα. . . .

Ael. *Ep. rust.* 2: τὴν οἶν τὴν τὰ μαλακὰ ἔρια, ἣν ἐπαινῶ πρὸς σέ, παρ' ἐμοῦ πρόσκειπε καὶ τὸ βοῖδίῳ καὶ τὴν κύνα, καὶ τὴν Μανίαν καὶ αὐτὴν χαίρειν κέλευε.

Ar. *Plut.* 1103 ff.:

ἀλλ' ἐκκάλει τὸν δεσπότην τρέχων ταχύ,
ἔπειτα τὴν γυναικα καὶ τὰ παιδία,
ἔπειτα τοὺς θεράποντας, εἶτα τὴν κύνα,
ἔπειτα σαντόν, εἶτα τὴν ὄν.

In these three passages the common feature is a humorous mingling of human beings and domestic animals in an invitation, a greeting, or a summons.¹ Having an eye only for Alciphron and Aelian, Reich at once concluded that Aelian copied Alciphron and clumsily overdid the matter, "ut imitatorum est," as he puts it (p. 42). But the resemblance between Aelian's letter and Alciphron's is no more marked than that between Aelian's and the passage from the *Plutus*. In fact the humor of this idea is undoubtedly more distinctly developed in the last two passages than it is in Alciphron's letter. It seems decidedly rash to maintain that Aelian must have got this idea from Alciphron and not directly from Aristophanes.

2. The rare Attic word *φελλεύς*, a rough, stony pasture-land, occurs in Alciphron twice (ii. 18. 2; iii. 34. 3), and in Aelian once (*Ep.* 2). Reich says that he has found it elsewhere only twice—Cratinus, fr. 271 Kock and Isaeus 8. 42. Upon these circumstances he builds the following argument (p. 41): Alciphron uses rare and peculiarly Attic expressions often, while Aelian is

¹The similarity between the passages in Aristophanes and Alciphron had already been noted by Volkmann (*Studia Alciphronica*, p. 9).

not wont to employ such unusual words; furthermore, Aelian imitated neither Cratinus nor Isaeus: consequently he must have taken the word *φελλεύς* from Alciphron—a supposition which gains in likelihood from the fact that it occurs only in the *Letters*. This argument may be met with a direct denial of almost every point. In the first place, the second section of this paper will furnish sufficient proof that Aelian took some extremely rare words from the Attic Comedy. Again, it is by no means certain that he could not have picked up the word *φελλεύς* from even a cursory reading of some works of Cratinus. He quotes Cratinus twice (*N. A.* xii. 10; *V. H.* ii. 13), and it is probable that he imitates him in a peculiar passage, which will be discussed in the second section, “Aelian and the Comic Poets.” Furthermore, Reich seems to have overlooked three important passages in which the word *φελλεύς* occurs—*Ar. Ach.* 273; *Clouds* 71; *Plato Critias* 111 C—an omission which can hardly be explained except on the supposition that he regarded *φελλεύς* as a proper name in those places. But it has long since been proved that *φελλεύς* is a common noun, and not the name of an Attic mountain district.¹ It is just as likely that Aelian learned this word from his readings in Aristophanes or Plato as it is that he borrowed it from Alciphron; and the fact that he uses it only in the *Letters* has just the same significance that we may attach to the occurrence of other rare Atticisms, not used by Alciphron, in this same work. Reich, however, finds what he considers a certain proof of Aelian’s unintelligent plagiarism in the fact that he misuses the word *φελλεύς*, employing it, apparently, in the sense of “stone” instead of “stony ground.” The sentence runs ‘*Ημέρων ὁ μαλακὸς φελλεῖ* (MSS *φελλέα*) *ἐπέκοψε τὸ σκέλος* (*Ep.* 2) which, if we accept Hercher’s reading, we must render as he does, *delicatus Hemero crus in saxum impegit*. This sentence, as will be shown more fully in another connection, is based upon a passage in Menander’s *Γεωργός* where the corresponding words are *Κλαίνετος . . . πρῶν ποτ’ ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις | σκάπτων διέκοψε τὸ σκέλος, κτλ.* (Geneva fragment 46 ff.). The presence of *σκάπτων* here, and farther on (l. 65) of *δικέλλης*, the implement that Cleaenetus was using, sug-

¹ See, for example, Kock on Cratinus fr. 86, or Wyse on Isaeus 8. 42.

gests *δικελλη* instead of *φελλεῖ* in the Aelian passage;¹ but it is hard to see how a corruption of Aelian's text could result in a word so unusual as *φελλεύς*. But granting that Aelian misunderstood the word, it is still not proved that Alciphron was his source. Neither of the two passages where Alciphron uses it would be likely to mislead an interpreter as to its meaning. One of them (ii. 18. 2), where something is said about a thief stealing a goat *ἐκ τοῦ φελλέως*—hardly “out of a stone”—is clear enough to set the stupidest interpreter right.

3. Another argument of Reich's is concerned with the ironical use of *χρυσούς*, “precious ass,” which occurs in Alc. ii. 14. 2 and iii. 33. 1, and in Ael. *Ep.* 19. Reich remarks (p. 38) “ironice autem hanc vocem e scriptoribus Alciphronis tempora antecedentibus nemo nisi Lucianus semel adhibet (*Laps.* 1).” To this should be added Luc. *Indoct.* 9, and I suspect that other examples could be found in Lucian. Two cases to which Schmid calls attention (*Atticismus* I. 303), namely Luc. *Prom. es in verbis* 1, *Peregr.* 33, are figurative but not ironical. But as Schmid points out (*op. cit.* I. 164, 303), the way for this idiom was prepared as early as Plato. Cf. *Phaedr.* 235 E, *φίλτατος εἰ καὶ ὥς ἀληθῶς χρυσούς*. Jowett renders this “You are a dear golden simpleton.” Cf. also Cassius Dio lxxii. 16.

4. The very rare adverb *κορικῶς* occurs, as noted by Reich, in Alc. i. 12. 1, *αἰσχύνεσθαι κορικῶς*, and Ael. *Ep.* 19, *αἰδουμένη κορικῶς*. Add Ael. *N. A.* ii. 38, *βαδίζει δὲ (ἡ ἰβις) ἡσυχῇ καὶ κορικῶς*. Aelian's clever application of the word in this last passage to the stately, maidenish tread of the ibis gives him a right to it from which we should hesitate to oust him in favor of Alciphron. Besides, the word was used nearly two centuries before Aelian by Philo *Vit. Mos.* i. 10 (Vol. II, p. 89, Mangey).

5. As another proof of the imitation which he alleges, Reich brings together Alc. iii. 5. 2, *θρύπτεται καὶ συνεχῶς ἀκκίζεται*, Ael. *Ep.* 9, *ἀκκίζονται καὶ θρύπτονται*, in which passages the two similar phrases refer to the simulated coyness of wily courtesans. But it should be observed that the MSS of Aelian show here *ἀκκίζουσι*

¹Since writing the above I find that the same conjecture has been made by Kaibel, *Götting. Nachrichten*, 1898, p. 158, n. 10.

καὶ θρύπτουσιν ἑαυτάς, a circumstance which lessens the value of the sentence as evidence, even though we must acknowledge that the use of these verbs in the active voice is unexampled elsewhere. ἀκκίζομαι occurs in practically the same sense in Philippid. fr. 5, Kock, Alc. iv. 10. 1, 13. 15, 14. 5, Ael. fr. 123; in a somewhat broader sense, "to affect indifference," Plat. *Gorg.* 497A, Plut. *Sympos.*, p. 620B, Luc. *De merc. cond.* 14. θρύπτομαι occurs in this same sense Ael. *Ep.* 1, cf. Eupolis, fr. 358 K., Luc. *Dial. mer.* 12. 1, and Ar. *Eq.* 1163, a doubtful text. In a different sense Ael. *V. H.* i. 19, fr. 70.

6. Reich cites αὐτόχρημα as a "vox perrara" (p. 39) from Alc. ii. 22. 2, 26. 1; Ael. *Ep.* 12. He finds it elsewhere only in Ar. *Eq.* 78 and Luc. *Dem. enc.* 13. Pointing out that the *Demosthenis encomium* is not Lucianic, and reiterating the worse than perilous declaration that Aelian never imitates Aristophanes, he argues that Aelian must have borrowed the word in question from the vocabulary of Alciphron (p. 40). He goes on to show, by way of strengthening his case, that Alciphron uses eight compounds of αὐτο- while Aelian has only two in the *Letters*. This ignores the disparity in the length of the works under examination as well as the fact that only a part of Aelian's *Letters* has been preserved. But the whole argument may be disposed of by a fuller statement of the usage of αὐτόχρημα.¹ Add Ael. *N. A.* ii. 44; xiv. 10; *V. H.* iv. 20, *Ep. rust.* 8, fr. 118, a fragment in *Etym. Magn.* 438. 16 attributed by Nauck to Alciphron (Alc., ed. Schepers, p. 157), schol. Luc. *Pisc.* 37. The word also occurs a number of times in Aristides (*vide* Schmid's indexes). The contention that Aelian must have got the word from Alciphron is untenable in the face of the references given.

7. Alc. ii. 34. 3: τῷ δ' ἐγὼ ἐγκανάξας κύλικα εὐμεγέθη φλυαρίας φάρμακον ὥρεγον, ὃ δὲ καὶ ταύτην καὶ πλείονας ἐπὶ ταύτῃ καὶ ἀδροτέρας ἐκπιῶν οὐκ ἐπαύσατο τῆς ἀδολεσχίας. Ael. *Ep.* 4 τρεῖς ἀδρὰς ἐξεκάναξα κύλικας. This comparison does not, as Reich thinks (p. 39) throw any light upon Aelian's supposed imitation of Alciphron. ἐγκανᾶσσω and ἐκκανᾶσσω are two different verbs. The former appears to be found elsewhere only in Ar. *Eq.*

¹For this word my notes were materially supplemented by Schmid's lists.

105,¹ the latter only in Eupolis Φιλ. 272 (Kock), τήνδε (sc. κύλικά) αὐτὸς ἐκκανάξει. Aelian's readings in the Comedy, which will be more fully illustrated in section II, makes it quite permissible to explain the use of this verb as a borrowing from Eupolis. ἀδρότερον πιεῖν is found in Diphil. Αἶρ. 5 (Kock).

8. κυχλίζειν, Alc. ii. 24. 2; iii. 42. 2; iv. 6. 3; Ael. *Ep.* 11. This rare verb occurs also in Ar. *Nub.* 983, fr. 333 (H. and G.), and in Theocr. xi. 78.² That Aelian was indebted for it to Alciphron rather than to Aristophanes is by no means clear.

9. Alc. ii. 18. 2: ὁ δὲ λύκος ἀργαλέος πάροιχος, Ael. *Ep.* 13: σὺ δὲ . . . ἄγροικος εἶ καὶ γείτοσιν οὐκ ἀγαθὸς πάροιχος . . . καὶ μέγα κέκραγας ἰδὼν ἄνθρωπον ὡς διώκων λύκον, καὶ ἀργαλέος εἶ . . . : These passages are cited only to show at what straws Reich catches (p. 38). If any point in the comparison deserves attention it is the personal or quasi-personal use of ἀργαλέος, which is stated by L. and S. to be rare in prose. This use, however, is found in Ar. *Nub.* 450, *Eq.* 978, Menander Πλοκ. 2 (Meineke), all of which cases are cited by L. and S., and Luc. *Pseudol.* 19 may be added.

Such is Reich's evidence, which, in strict fairness to his method, I have been obliged to discuss at undesirable length. It will be observed that he does not call attention to even one point of resemblance between Alciphron and Aelian which cannot be explained in one of three ways: as a natural characteristic of the *genre* epistle as a literary form, as a feature taken by both writers from earlier sources, or as an expression belonging to contemporary or slightly earlier usage, with a wider circulation than Reich admits, and hence used with equal right by both authors. Partial or entire coincidences in the exploitation of the comic vocabulary have been shown to be especially frequent.³ It is the purpose of the second section to show that Aelian's study of the comic poets was independent of Alciphron.

¹In Eur. *Cycl.* 152, Valckenaer and Pierson read ἐγκάναξον for MSS ἐκπάταξον.

²Schmid (*op. cit.* III, p. 245) classes κυχλίζειν, rather strangely, under the head, "Aus dem Gebrauch späterer Schriftsteller."

³Alciphron and Aelian agree in the use of at least four words of comic coloring which are not noticed by Reich: ἄβρα, αἰγίδιον, εἰλη (cf. Luc. *Lexiph.* 2), πανδαισία (cf. Harpocr. s. v.). Others could doubtless be added.

II. AELIAN AND THE COMIC POETS

1. Menander Γεωργός, Geneva fragment 46 ff.

ὁ Κλεαίνετος γάρ, οὗ τὸ μειράκιον [ἀγρόν
[ἐ]ργάζεται, πρῶν ποτ' ἐν ταῖς ἀμ[πέλοις
σκ[ά]πτων διέκοψε τὸ σκέλος χρησ[τῶς] πάνυ.

50 ἀπὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἔλκου, ὡς τριταῖον ἐγένετο
βουβῶν ἐπήρθη τῷ γέροντι, θέρμα τε
ἐπέλαβεν αὐτόν, καὶ κακῶς ἔσχεν πάνυ.¹

Ael. *Ep.* 2 Ἡμέρων ὁ μαλακὸς φελλεῖ (MSS φελλέα) ἐπέκοψε
τὸ σκέλος πάνυ χρηστῶς καὶ θέρμη ἐπέλαβεν αὐτοῦ καὶ βουβῶν
ἐπήρθη.

Disregarding chronology, I have given the first place to this comparison, because we have here a context of Menander that is full enough to enable us to judge how closely Aelian imitated the language of his models. With this case in mind, we may believe that if larger portions of the lost works of the older comedians had been preserved, Aelian's borrowings from them would be more conspicuous, and cases of imitation which we now characterize as probable might be marked certain. These passages hardly need comment. Aelian's apparent misuse of the word φελλεύς has already been discussed.

2. Ar. *Ach.* 994 ff.:

ἀλλά σε λαβὼν τρία δοκῶ γ' ἂν ἔτι προσβαλεῖν ·
πρῶτα μὲν ἂν ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον ἐλάσαι μακρόν,
εἶτα παρὰ τόνδε νέα μοσχίδια συγκίδων,
καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἡμερίδος ὄρχον, ὃ γέρων ὀδί,
καὶ περὶ τὸ χωρίον ἐλᾶδας ἅπαν ἐν κύκλῳ.

Ael. *Ep.* 4: Τί σοι καλὸν εἶργασται καὶ τί σοι πεπόνηται χρη-
στόν; ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον ἐλάσας, εἶτα μοσχίδια συγκίδων
παραφυτεύσας ἀπαλά, καὶ ἐν κύκλῳ περὶ τὸ αὐλιον κατέπηξα ἐλᾶδας.

The imitation is plain enough. It confirms ὄρχον, the reading of the Aldine edition and some minor MSS, where the vulgate has the impossible κλάδον. Brunck had proposed ὄσχον, Bergk ὄξον.

3. Cratinus, fr. 298 Kock:

ὡς ἄνω τὴν μασχάλην αἴρωμεν ἐμπεπωκότες.

¹The text is that of Grenfell and Hunt. Aelian's imitation of lines 51, 52, which were known before the discovery of the Geneva fragment, was observed by Kock on Menand. fr. 98; see also Kaibel *loc. cit.*

Ael. *Ep.* 15. οὐ χεῖρον δ' ἂν εἴη οἰνωμένον σε καὶ μασχάλην ἄραι.

μασχάλην αἶρειν is noted by Hesychius and others¹ as an action characteristic of drunken conduct. It seems to occur in the literature only in the passages cited. The parallelism ἐμπεπωκότες : οἰνωμένον is an additional proof that Aelian had Cratinus in mind here.

4. μυστιλῶμαι, "sop up," is one of the rare Attic words satirized by Lucian in the *Lexiphanes* (§ 5). It occurs elsewhere so far as I can discover, only in Ar. *Eq.* 827, 1168, *Plut.* 627, and Ael. *Ep.* 9.

5. ἀποφράς, *nefastus*, as applied to persons is extremely rare. I have found it only in the following passages:

Eupolis, fr. 309 Kock:

συνέντυχεν ἐξιώντι μοι
ἄνθρωπος ἀποφράς καὶ βλέπων ἀπιστίαν.

Ael. *Ep.* 15: σὺ μὲν τῶν ἀποφράδων διαφέρεις οὐδὲν οὕτως ἄγριος ὢν καὶ μονήρης τὸν τρόπον. Ael. fr. 325: ὁ ἀποτρόπαιος καὶ οἶον ἀποφράς. Synes. *Ep.* 79 *ad init.* ἀποφράς ἄνθρωπος. The unfamiliar character of the word is shown by Lucian's defense of the phrase ἡ ἀποφράς (*sc.* ἡμέρα) in the *Pseudologistes*, especially §§ 8, 11, 32.

6. Other examples of Aelian's exploitation of comic usage may be briefly indicated without comment. ὠράζομαι, give oneself airs, occurs in Eupol. fr. 358 (Kock) ὠραζομένη καὶ θρυπτομένη, Ar. *Eccl.* 202, Cratinus fr. 272 (K.), in Ael. *Ep.* 1. ἐθρύπτετο καὶ ὠραζομένη πολλοῖς ἔβαλλε τοῖς σκώμμασιν, and again in *Ep.* 9, παρόντων δὲ ἡμῶν ὠράζονται (of courtesans). ὠράζομαι is not so used in Alciphron. ἐπιτύφομαι with gen. of person, to be inflamed with love, is found in Ar. *Lys.* 221 and Ael. *Ep.* 1; not in Alciphron. τρυγᾶν, *sensu obsceno*, Ar. *Pax* 1338 τρυγήσομεν αὐτήν, Ael. *Ep.* 1 τῆς ὥρας ἐτρύγησα. Cf. Luc. *Dial. mer.* 1. 2; *Anth. Pal.* xii. 256. 1. Not in Alciphron.² βωλοκοπεῖν, Ar. fr. 761 (K.); Schol. *Pax* 566, 1148; Ael. *Ep.* 19; not in Alciphron. Amphis *Φιλαδ.* fr. 33 K.: δρᾶ τι καὶ νεανικὸν | καὶ θερμόν; Ael.

¹ Hesychius and Suidas s. vv. "Αἶρε μασχάλην," "μασχάλην αἶρεις;" Zenob. *Cent.* v. 7.

² Schmid notes Lucian's use of this expression (*op. cit.* I, p. 396), but not Aelian's.

Ep. 15: εἰ δέ που καὶ μεθύων κόρη περιπέσοις τάχα πού τι καὶ θερμὸν δράσεις καὶ νεανικὸν ἔργον, cf. *Ar. Plut.* 415 f. ὃ θερμὸν ἔργον τολμῶντε δρᾶν. Alciphron does not use νεανικός thus, though we find νεανικῶς κραιπαλᾶν in iv. 13. 18. Cf. further *Luc. Conv.* 3; *Plat. Ep.* 4. 320 D.¹ The πῶσινον ἔννος, pea soup, of which we hear in the Comedy (*Ar. Eq.* 1171, *Antiph. Παρασ.* 183 K.) is the dinner of Aelian's farmer in *Ep.* 4.

When it is remembered that the resemblances noted in this section have to do with rather unusual terms of expression, and that none of them is matched in Alciphron, it seems a justifiable conclusion that Aelian studied the comic poets independently; and in the light of this conclusion we should regard it as highly probable that the comic words and phrases in section I also were taken by Aelian directly from the Attic Comedy, and not through the medium of Alciphron's *Letters*. Aelian seems to have wished to reproduce in these *Epistulae Rusticae* the atmosphere of the rural Attica of the classical period, and to have sought to accomplish this end by borrowing from various sources incidents and ideas characteristic of country life, rare words used chiefly in connection with agriculture, and, in general, peculiar archaisms. He certainly drew upon Aristophanes, Demosthenes, and Menander, probably upon Eupolis and Cratinus; others also may have been used, for my notes bearing upon his relations to earlier writers make no claim to completeness. The *Letters* owe more to the Comedy than to other sources simply because its popular language and its frequent introduction of rural personages made its vocabulary and its ideas especially adaptable. If we knew more Attic comedies, it is likely that we should be able to declare without qualification what I already suspect in view of the evidence at hand—namely, that these *Letters* of Aelian are throughout little more than a stupid patchwork of material derived chiefly from the Comedy. I cannot believe, therefore, that Aelian imitated Alciphron, as has been alleged; and although the date assigned to Alciphron by Reich is in itself probable enough, it must, in my judgment, be determined by other evidence.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

¹This use of νεανικός is not noted in Schmid's index.